



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,795	11/07/2005	John Charles Sinclair	3642.1001-000	9371
21005 7590 05/07/2010 HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C. 530 VIRGINIA ROAD P.O. BOX 9133 CONCORD, MA 01742-9133				
EXAMINER				
LEE, JAE W				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1656				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/07/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/530,795	Applicant(s) SINCLAIR ET AL.		
	Examiner JAE W. LEE	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Art Unit 1656</td> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> </tr> </table>	Art Unit 1656	
Art Unit 1656				

All Participants:

(1) JAE W. LEE

(2) Hak Chang

Date of Interview: 30 April 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: After non-final rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1 and 35-42

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/SUZANNE M. NOAKES/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In the interest of compact prosecution, the Examiner proposed an Examiner's amendment that would likely put the case into conditions for allowance. The proposed amendment requires: [1] inserting "crystalline" before the phrase "protein lattice" in claim 1; [2] inserting limitations of claims 35, 37 and 39 into claim 1, i.e., inserting ", wherein said first oligomer assembly...[limitations of claim 35], [limitations of claim 37], or [limitations of claim 39]"; [3] inserting "wherein first and second oligomer assembly are distinct" or "different" in claim 1; and [4] correcting spelling errors and writing out the abbreviations in newly added claims 35-42. The Examiner also explained the basis for the proposed amendment which includes overcoming rejections of record under 112 1st paragraph written description and enablement, and other potential prior art rejections.